DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 258 300 CS 504 956

AUTHOR Plax, Timothy G.; And Others
TITLE Power in the Classroom VI: Verbal Control Strategies, Nonverbal Immediacy and Affective Learning.
PUB DATE [84]
NOTE 30p.; For other volumes in series, see ED 215 389 ED 225 218, ED 238 062, ED 251 868, and CS 504 955.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Affective Objectives; Behavior Problems; *Classroom Communication; Classroom Environment; Classroom Techniques; *Communication Research; Elementary Secondary Education; *Nonverbal Communication; Speech Communication; Student Behavior; Teacher Behavior; Teacher Student Relationship; *Verbal Communication
IDENTIFIERS Behavior Alteration Techniques

ABSTRACT

Recognizing that nonverbal behaviors typically provide the framework for interpreting verbal messages, this project (the sixth in a series of projects designed to examine teacher power in the classroom) proposed and sequentially tested a heuristic model of student affective learning as a function of behavior alteration techniques and teacher nonverbal immediacy. Employing a two-study correlational design, the model was tested in five stages across secondary and college students. Results supported the proposed positive relationships among teachers' use of behavior alteration techniques, immediacy, and student affect for both studies. Teachers' selective use of verbal control strategies in the classroom was shown to be indirectly related to affective learning as a function of students' perceptions of teacher immediacy. (Author/EL)

**********
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
**********

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.



ED258300

# Power in the Classroom VI: Verbal Control Strategies, Nonverbal Immediacy and Affective Learning

Timothy G. Plax

Space Transportation Systems Division

Rockwell International Corp., Downey, CA.

Patricia Kearney

California State University, Sacramento

James C. McCroskey

Virginia P. Richmond

West Virginia University

Running Head: POWER IN THE CLASSROOM

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Patricia Kearney
Timothy G. Plax
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."



CS 504 956

Abstract

This investigation is the sixth in a series of projects designed to programmatically examine teacher power in the classroom. Recognizing that nonverbal behaviors typically provide the framework for interpreting verbal messages, this project proposed and sequentially tested a heuristic model of student affective learning as a function of behavior alteration techniques and teacher nonverbal immediacy. Employing a two-study correlational design, the model was tested in five stages across secondary and college students. Results supported the proposed positive relationships among teachers' use of behavior alteration techniques, immediacy and student affect for both studies. Teachers' selective use of verbal control strategies in the classroom was shown to be indirectly related to affective learning as a function of students' perceptions of teacher immediacy. Interpretations focus on the model, previous power in the classroom studies, and the design of future studies in this program.

# Power in the Classroom VI: Verbal Control Strategies, Nonverbal Immediacy and Affective Learning

Educators are often retained and tenured on their ability to make students learn. In this way, effective teaching is equated with the successful control of students in the classroom (c.f., Hoy, 1968). In practice, however, the discipline orientation may actually work against superordinate concerns of student learning. Demanding student submission by exerting teacher authority typically results in both increased incidences of student disruptions and decreased affect toward the learning process (c.f., Clegg & Megson, 1968; Heal, 1978; Hoy, 1968; Rutter, Maughan, Mortimore, Ouston & Smith, 1979; Wlodkowski, 1982).

In a more constructive response to the need for student control, educators and researchers alike have been examining potential classroom management techniques that elicit active student cooperation in the learning process. Within the classroom management orientation, discipline loses its custodial meaning and pervasive emphasis. Instead, classroom control is redefined to include those management techniques which influence students to want to learn. Effective classroom managers then, are those teachers who are able to both encourage high levels of student involvement in learning situations as well as minimize student behaviors that interfere with on-task activities (Emmer & Evertson, 1981).

As classroom managers, teachers use prompts (Krantz & Scarth, 1979), motivational messages, structured transitions (Arlin, 1979), positive questioning techniques (Borg & Ascione, 1979), and other teacher strategies to promote students' on-task persistence. In addition, behavioral contracts (Harris, 1972), incentive systems (Emmer & Evertson, 1981) and other positive control

techniques can be employed by teachers to discourage off-task behaviors by providing concurrent rewards for on-task activity.

In extending perspectives on classroom management, another approach has emerged from the instructional communication literature which focuses on teachers' use of power in gaining student control. Recent research in this area has examined the application of message-based techniques that teachers strategically communicate to compel students to engage in on-task behaviors (Kearney, Plax, Richmond, & McCroskey, 1983; in press; McCroskey, Richmond, Plax & Kearney, 1984). To date, investigations into teachers' use of message strategies have been concerned only with the effects of the verbal or content component for eliciting student involvement. Successfully communicating selective power-based messages to encourage on-task behaviors may also require the concomitant influence of a teachers' nonverbal approach orientations which signal positive affect.

Recognizing that nonverbal messages typically provide the framework for interpreting verbal messages (Burgoon, 1980; Burgoon & Saine, 1978; Mehrabian, 1981; Wiener & Mehrabian, 1968), teacher nonverbal behaviors in the classroom may well provide the context for students' interpretations of those verbal control messages teachers employ. Nonverbal behaviors that, in combination, have been shown to communicate an approach or liking orientation are referred to as immediacy cues (Andersen, 1979; Mehrabian, 1967). The present investigation attempts to clarify the role of teacher nonverbal immediacy in the selective use of verbal control strategies and students' attitudes toward the learning environment.

## The Research Program

The current investigation is the sixth in a series of projects focusing on teachers' use of power in managing the classroom and student learning.

The goal of this research program is the eventual generation of a communication-based theory of teacher influence designed to enhance student on-task behaviors that result in optimal student cognitive and affective learning. Within this research program, the first two studies relied on the assessment of French and Raven's (1959) broad-based typology adapted for teacher influence. The results of these two studies indicated a substantial association between student perceptions of selective teacher power usage and cognitive and affective learning (McCroskey & Richmond, 1983; Richmond & McCroskey, in press).

Considering the limitation of relying solely on general descriptions of power types, the next two studies generated an extended conceptual and operational typology of power-based teacher influence strategies (Kearney, Plax, Richmond & McCroskey, 1983, in press). These Behavioral Alteration Techniques (BATs) and specific messages representative of those techniques (Behavior Alteration Messages; BAMs) were most recently found to be differentially employed with academically good and poor students (McCroskey, Richmond, Plax & Kearney, 1984). In addition, the fifth power in the classroom study reported an association between selective BAT use and student affect. The present investigation extends the research program on power in the classroom by proposing and sequentially testing a heuristic model of student affect as a function of behavior alteration techniques and teacher nonverbal immediacy. This model was tested in five progressive stages across samples of both secondary and university students.

Stage 1

In partial replication and extension of Power 5 (McCroskey, Richmond, Plax & Kearney, 1984), the first hypothesis of the present investigation posited a relationship between teachers' differential use of behavior alteration techniques in classroom management and student's affective learning.

Whereas Power 5 relied on a sample of secondary students, this study sampled both secondary and university students in examining the relationship between perceptions of teachers' use of BATs and affect. The results of Power 5 further indicated that teachers and students' perceptions of BAT usage were inconsistent. Since students' rather than teachers' perceptions contributed predominantly to students' affect, the validity of teacher perceptions is questionable. Thus, hypothesis one (as well as all other relationships asserted in the proposed model) focused on student, rather than teacher perceptions.

$H_1$: Students' perceptions of teachers' selective use of BATs will be associated with students' affective learning.

In working toward a test of the complete model, Stage 2 focused on the relationship between students' perceptions of teacher nonverbal immediacy and student affect.

Stage 2

Immediacy is defined as the extent to which particular communication behaviors enhance physical or psychological closeness (Mehrabian, 1967). Specifically, nonverbal immediacy behaviors are most commonly cited as body lean, physical closeness, eye contact, smiling, and touch (Andersen, 1979; Burgoon, Buller, Hale & de Turck, in press; Mehrabian, 1981; Patterson, 1973). Andersen, Andersen and Jensen (1979) identified the additional nonverbal immediacy cues of positive head nods, purposeful gestures, and vocal expressiveness. Numerous studies have demonstrated the relative contribution of nonverbal immediacy cues in communicating positive attitudes (c.f , Argyle & Kendon, 1967; Burgoon et al, 1984 ; Exline & Winters, 1965; Keiser & Altman, 1976; Kendon, 1967; Major & Heslin, 1982; Mehrabian, 1968; 1969; Mehrabian & Ksionzky, 1972).

Collectively, the nonverbal behaviors that comprise the immediacy construct indicate an approach orientation toward others, resulting in interpersonal closeness, sensory stimulation, warmth and friendliness. As originally conceived, immediacy characterizes the role of these approach behaviors in determining attitudes between communicators (Mehrabian, 1967; 1968; 1969; Weiner & Mehrabian, 1968). According to Mehrabian (1971), interactants' nonverbal behavior stance can be understood in terms of the following immediacy principle: "People are drawn toward persons and things they like, evaluate highly, and prefer; and they avoid or move away from things they dislike, evaluate negatively, or do not prefer" (p. 1). In behavioral terms, immediacy is based on approach-avoidance. Approach behaviors indicate "liking," while non-immediacy or avoidance behaviors indicate "disliking." Nonverbal immediacy cues then, are affectively based.

Research on teacher nonverbal immediacy behaviors in the classroom has been based on the proposition that teachers nonverbally communicate attitudes toward students. As such, immediate teachers communicate positive attitudes or approach orientations, while nonimmediate teachers signal distancing and detachment. In this way, "liking encourages greater immediacy and immediacy produces more liking" (Mehrabian, 1971, p. 7). Consequently, teachers who evaluate their students highly are more likely to be immediate and in turn, students are more likely to reciprocally respond to those teachers.

Without exception, the research examining the teacher immediacy/student affect relationship has consistently demonstrated a substantial, positive association between the two constructs. These results have been replicated in secondary and college classes (Andersen, 1979; Andersen, Norton & Nussbaum, 1981; Kearney, Plax, Wendt-Wasco, 1984; McDowell, McDowell & Hyerdahl, 1980), across divergent course content (Kearney et al., 1984), and in modified mastery

and traditional course structures (Andersen, 1979; Kearney et al., 1984). The following hypothesis represents a retest of the immediacy/affect relationship reflected in the second stage of the proposed model:

$H_2$: Students' perceptions of teachers' nonverbal immediacy will be positively associated with students' affective learning.

Stage 3 proposes a relationship between teacher nonverbal immediacy and teachers' selective use of behavior alteration techniques.

Stage 3

While the BAT/immediacy relationship has not been previously investigated, the literature provides indirect support for positing a potential relationship between the two constructs. Watzlawick, Beavin and Jackson (1967) assert that all communication is comprised of a relational and content component. Both co-exist to assist in the eventual assignment of meaning. The relational component defines the nature of the relationship between interactants, providing the framework for understanding the content component of the message exchange. Relational messages are communicated primarily through nonverbal channels, whereas content messages are reflected primarily in verbal channels (Burgoon, Buller, Hale, de Turck, 1984 ; Burgoon & Saine, 1967). Conceptually then, verbally-based BATs (i.e., content) may be interpreted within the framework of nonverbally-based immediacy cues (i.e., relational).

Furthermore, Condon and Ogston (1966) found a synchronous relationship between verbal and nonverbal cues. More to the point, Exline and Eldridge (1967) report that two verbal messages were decoded differentially when accompanied by nonverbal cues. Subjects interpreted the verbal message more positively when it was associated with more eye contact than the same message communicated with less eye contact.

Unlike those investigations which treated specific verbal messages directly coupled with particular nonverbal cues, this investigation argued that the use of specific control messages are better understood or interpreted within the context of students' perceptions of teachers' generalized nonverbal approach/avoidance orientations. That is, the BAT/immediacy relationship may not rely on specific immediacy cues associated with the specific verbal control message employed. Instead, students may rely on their teachers' generalized immediacy orientation in their interpretation of those teacher control techniques frequently used in the classroom.

The BAT/immediacy relationship in the classroom may be furtner understood in terms of the research on teacher communication styles of assertiveness and responsiveness (Kearney & McCroskey, 1980). Similar to the conceptual basis of behavior alteration techniques, teacher assertiveness refers to perceptions of teacher control in managing the classroom. Assertive teachers are perceived as decisive, deliberate, challenging, aggressive and as assuming positions of control. Not unlike immediacy, responsiveness refers to perceptions of teacher concern for students. Responsive teachers are characterized as sensitive, social, understanding, and approachable. Students' perceptions of teacher assertiveness and responsiveness were found to be substantially and positively associated (Kearney & McCroskey, 1980). Correspondingly, students' perceptions of teachers' use of BATs and immediacy should be related. Moreover, students may perceive that immediate teachers selectively employ particular BATs consistent with teachers' overall nonverbal approach orientation. Thus,

$H_3$: Teachers' selective use of BATs will be significantly associated with student perceptions of teacher immediacy.

Stage 4 of the proposed model posits an extended relationship between teachers' nonverbal immediacy and selective BAT use with students' affective learning.

Stage 4

Assuming support for the hypothesized relationships between selective BAT use and student affect ($H_1$), as well as teacher immediacy and affective learning ($H_2$), the following hypothesis suggests that both selective control techniques and teacher approach behaviors may improve the overall predictability of students' affect. That is, teachers who are perceived as immediate and who selectively employ control strategies in managing students will, correspondingly, impact students' overall affect toward the learning environment.

Consistent with this interpretation, Kearney and McCroskey (1980) reported that positive student affect was best interpreted as a function of the combined predictors of teacher assertiveness and responsiveness. Based on student perceptions, their results suggest that students evaluate highly those teachers whom they perceive to be decisive and "in charge" as well as approachable and accessible. In combination then, teachers who employ verbal control strategies and who communicate nonverbal immediacy may be associated with greater student affect than either predictor alone.

$H_4$: A linear combination of teacher immediacy and BAT use will be positively associated with student affective learning.

The final stage represents a combination of the reasoning represented in the progressive phases of the proposed model.

Stage 5

Without denying some degree of potential reciprocal influence in the hypothesized relationship between selective BAT use and teacher immediacy, the following research question addresses the primary path of influence between selective BAT use and teacher immediacy on student affect.

RQ: Which of the conceptual models presented in figure 1 offers a potentially better explanation of the immediacy, BAT, and affective learning relationship?

---

Figure 1 about here

---

Model A suggests that selective BAT use is indirectly associated with affective learning based on students' perceptions of teacher immediacy. Model B suggests that teacher immediacy is indirectly associated with students' affect based on perceptions of teachers' use of BATs. Empirical support for Model A would indicate that teacher immediacy and immediacy and BAT use in combination are the best predictors of student affect. Conversely, support for Model B would indicate that BAT use and BAT use and immediacy in combination are the best predictors of affective learning. Of primary concern in both models is the relative importance of either teacher immediacy (Model A) or selective BAT use (Model B) on positive or negative student affect.

## Procedures

### Design

Two studies were conducted in order to test the hypotheses and the research question advanced in the present investigation. The basic design of the two studies was similar to that of the Richmond and McCroskey (in press) and the McCroskey, Richmond, Plax and Kearney (1984) studies. In the first study of this investigation, junior high and senior high school teachers were contacted and requested to have their students (student N = 620, class N = 47, school N = 15) complete three instruments: BATs, teacher immediacy, and student affective learning.

The second study involved a sample of university students enrolled in a variety of different courses from various colleges at a large university (N = 1320, class N = 53) who completed the same three questionnaires. In order to obtain maximum variability in subject matter fields and a broad

sample of professors (specifically including professors who would not normally agree to participate in research), students were asked to complete the instruments with reference to "the class which you attended immediately before this class." In this way data relating to over 900 different classes/professors were obtained from the subjects. All data collection was completed approximately one week prior to the end of the semester. Code numbers were employed to guarantee anonymity and to allow for data analysis.

Measurement

Behavior Alteration Techniques (BATs). Students in both study 1 and 2 were provided with sets of behavior alteration messages (BAMs) representing each of the 22 BATs generated by Kearney et al. (in press). Since the original BAMs reflected those messages an elementary or secondary teacher might use in the classroom, BAMs were rewritten for BATs 2, 3, 12 and 16 for the college student questionnaire to more appropriately represent sample messages a college teacher might employ (see Table 1). BAT labels were omitted from the questionnaire for both samples. Students were asked to rate on a 1 - 5 scale "how frequently your teacher uses statements of each

---

Table 1 about here

---

type to get you to change your behavior in the classroom." Higher scores indicated greater frequency.

Teacher Immediacy. Students' perceptions of teacher nonverbal immediacy were measured by the Generalized Immediacy Scale (GI) developed by Andersen (1979). A general or gestalt impression of an instructor's immediacy is assessed with the GI scale. The GI provides a description of the immediacy construct followed by two sets of semantic differential-type scales. Students

in both samples were asked to evaluate the degree to which their instructor fit the gestalt. Previous research employing the GI scale has indicated concurrent validity with specific nonverbal behavioral indices of immediacy cues (c.f., Andersen, 1979; Andersen, Norton & Nussbaum, 1981; Rodgers & McCroskey, 1984). In addition, the use of the GI, assessing gestalt impressions of teachers' overall nonverbal approach orientation rather than individual behaviors, more appropriately addressed the concerns of this investigation. Factor analyses on both samples indicated a single-factor solution for the GI with alpha reliability estimates above .89.

Student Affective Learning. Student affect was defined to parallel those hierarchical objectives of the affective domain within the Krathwohl, Bloom and Masia (1956) learning taxonomy. Consistent with those objectives, affect was operationalized to include lower order levels of students' attitudes toward the (1) course, (2) subject matter, and (3) instructor, as well as higher order levels of students' behavioral intentions of (4) engaging in behaviors taught in the class, and (5) taking additional classes in the subject matter. Each specified affect was measured by four, seven-step bipolar scales. These five sets of adjective pairs have been used repeatedly to measure student affect (Andersen, 1979; Andersen, Norton & Nussbaum, 1981; Kearney & McCroskey, 1980; Kearney et al., 1984; McCroskey et al., 1984; Scott & Wheeless, 1975). Alpha reliabilities for each of the measures were above .90. As an indicator of general affect, a total score was obtained by adding scores on all five measures (alpha reliability, above .90).

## Results

In order to test hypotheses one and two, simple correlations were computed between BAT use and the various affect measures, and between teacher

nonverbal immediacy and the same affect measures. As Table 2 indicates, eight BATs generated substantial correlations with affective learning scores for Study 1 (secondary sample). Immediate Reward from Behavior, Deferred Reward from Behavior, Self-Esteem, and Teacher Feedback were positively associated, whereas Punishment from Teacher, Legitimate-Teacher Authority, Debt, and Peer Modeling were negatively associated with affect. Six of the same eight BATs obtained in Study 1 were also substantially correlated with affective learning scores for college students in Study 2. Unlike secondary students, Debt and Peer Modeling were not meaningfully associated with affect for college students. Consequently, $H_1$ was supported. Overall, students' perceptions of teachers' selective BAT use was shown to be associated with students' affective learning.

Immediacy was significantly and positively associated with all affective learning scores for Study 1 and Study 2 (see Table 2). Consequently,

---

Table 2 about here

---

$H_2$ was supported. Students' perceptions of teachers' nonverbal immediacy were shown to be positively related to students' affective learning. However, for Study 2, the college sample, immediacy was more modestly associated with both "engaging in behaviors" and "enrolling in additional classes." Immediacy accounted for 12% of the variance in each criterion.

Testing hypothesis three required multiple regression analysis with all 22 BATs comprising the predictor set and immediacy as the single criterion. Results indicated a significant relationship between BAT use and immediacy for Study 1 ($R^2 = .436$, $F = 3.62$, $p < .0001$) and Study 2 ($R^2 = .286$, $F = 22.72$, $p < .0001$). Thus, $H_3$ was supported. Teachers'

selective use of BATs was shown to be significantly related to student perceptions of teacher immediacy. Supplementary analyses employing correlations between those BATs found to be substantially associated with affect scores (see results $H_1$) and immediacy revealed the following results: For Study 1, immediacy was positively and substantially associated with Immediate Reward from Behavior (.29), Deferred Reward from Behavior (.22), Self-Esteem (.30), and Teacher Feedback (.37), but negatively associated with Punishment from Teacher (-.24), Legitimate-Teacher Authority (-.33), Debt (-.20) and Peer Modeling (-.25). For Study 2, immediacy was positively and substantially associated with Immediate Reward from Behavior (.37), Deferred Reward from Behavior (.20), Self-Esteem (.28) and Teacher Feedback (.26), but negatively associated with Punishment from Teacher (-.20) and Legitimate-Teacher Authority (-.25).

Hypothesis four was tested employing multiple regression analyses with teacher immediacy and all 22 BATs comprising the predictor set and each of the six affect scores comprising the separate criterion for each analysis. As Table 3 indicates, the combined predictors of immediacy and BATs generated

---

Table 3 about here

---

substantial associations with total affect ($R^2$ = .686, $F$ = 9.70), behaviors recommended in the course ($R^2$ = .584, $F$ = 6.24), course content ($R^2$ = .619, $F$ = 7.21), instructor ($R^2$ = .724, $F$ = 11.64), engaging in course practices ($R^2$ = .477, $F$ = 4.05) and enrolling in another course ($R^2$ = .395, $F$ = 4.05) for Study 1. For Study 2, the combined predictors of immediacy and BATs generated substantial associations with total affect ($R^2$ = .667, $F$ = 45.85), behaviors recommended in the course ($R^2$ = .372, $F$ = 31.54), course content ($R^2$ = .306, $F$ = 23.66) and instructor ($R^2$ = .589,

$F$ = 77.06); and, to a lesser extent, engaging in course practices ($R^2$ = .215, $F$ = 14.72) and enrolling in another course ($R^2$ = .190, $F$ = 12.68. All results were significant at alpha .0001 for both samples. Consequently, $H_4$ was supported. A linear combination of teacher immediacy and BAT use was shown to be positively related to student affective learning.

Explicating models A and B of the research question required decomposition of the multiple Rs obtained in the previous analyses. Employing commonality analyses, the relative unique and combined contributions of each predictor (immediacy and BATs) to student affect was obtained. As Table 3 indicates, commonality analyses demonstrated that overall, the best interpretation for total explained variance in the various affect criterion scores was unique variance contributed by teacher immediacy and the combination of both BATs and immediacy. These results were obtained for both samples. Consequently, Model A provided the better explanation of the overall BAT, immediacy and affect relationship. That is, teachers' selective BAT use was shown to be indirectly related to affective learning as a function of students' perceptions of teacher immediacy.

## Discussion

This investigation extends the research program on power in the classroom by presenting and sequentially explicating a model of affective learning which considers both behavior alteration techniques and teacher nonverbal immediacy. To date, this research program has not examined the impact of both selective power-based messages and instructors' nonverbal approach orientations on student affect. Results of the tests of the hypotheses and the research question empirically support the relationships among BAT use, immediacy and affect proposed in Model A. The Model serves to clarify how teacher nonverbal immediacy mediates the effect of verbal control strategies on students' attitudes toward the learning environment.

More specifically, Model A outlines the primary path of influence for BAT use and teacher immediacy on student affect. In explaining the data supporting Model A, the best predictors of students' affect were teacher immediacy alone and immediacy and BAT use in combination. Commonality analyses of these data revealed that variance accounted for in almost all affect scores across both student samples was only minimally attributable to BAT use alone. Exceptions to this pattern were the affective scores on "engaging in course practices" and "enrolling in another course." However, only modest variance was accounted for in these affective scores by either predictor alone (Study 1 and Study 2) or in combination (Study 2).

Support for Model A suggests that students' affect is primarily a function of perceptions of teacher nonverbal immediacy. In addition, students evaluate highly those teachers who are immediate and who employ selective behavior alteration techniques in classroom management. Consequently, positive student affect requires both an approach orientation as well as particular use of control strategies from their teachers. These results further indicate that positive student affect was associated with those verbal control messages that appear to be synchronous with nonverbal immediacy or approach. That is, for both student samples, teacher immediacy was positively and substantially associated with the use of primarily reward-oriented or prosocial BATs that consistently communicate student-oriented concerns. "You will find it rewarding," "It will help you later on in life," "You are the best person to do it," and "To see how well you can do it " all reflect student-centered approaches to compliance.

In contrast to the prosocial BATs. generalized nonverbal immediacy was shown to be negatively associated with the use of primarily punishment-oriented or anti-social BATs that consistently communicate teacher or

students' peer group concerns. "I will punish you if you don't," "Because I told you to," "You owe me one," and "All your friends are doing it" all reflect teacher or other-centered approaches to compliance. Consequently, the selective use of BATs may assist students in their perceptions of teachers' overall verbal and nonverbal approach/avoidance orientation in the classroom. Employing those PATs that signal approach and student concern as opposed to BATs that communicate avoidance or detachment may, concurrently, be reflected in teachers' nonverbal immediacy/non-immediacy behaviors.

In terms of overall impact then, Model A suggests that teachers' generalized nonverbal approach orientation may influence students' perceptions of teachers' selective use of BATs. That is, students perceive that immediate teachers rely on prosocial BATs for control. In reality, immediate teachers may actually employ occasional anti-social BATs as well. Recognizing that nonverbal cues typically provide the framework for understanding verbal messages, students may either disregard or interpret anti-social BATs used within the context of their teachers' previously defined nonverbal approach orientation. In this way, students' affect is a function of teachers' selective use of BATs mediated by perceptions of teacher immediacy. Future research should be designed to assess nonverbally immediate teachers' actual employment of BATs for classroom management. If immediate teachers employ both pro- and anti-social BATs, then generalized immediacy may supercede or modify the negative impact of anti-social control on students' affect. Such research would provide further empirical support for Model A.

In supporting Model A, the results of the present investigation also contribute to the generalizability of findings reported in previous research on power in the classroom. While previous research sampled elementary and secondary teachers/students, this design extends the findings to university

students. Obtaining similar results for both Study 1 (secondary) and Study 2 (college) strengthens the validity of Model A for interpreting and predicting the BAT use, immediacy and affect relationship. It should be noted, however, that the variance accounted for across all affective learning scores was consistently lower for the college student sample. Perhaps older students do not rely on teacher variables of control or approach as much as younger students for affective learning simply because college students have internalized greater independence as learners.

The results of this investigation are consistent with those of previous research on power in the classroom in several meaningful ways. To begin with, while previous research reported that prosocial BATs were associated with positive affect for secondary students (McCroskey et al., 1984), these findings suggest similar results for college students. Second, teachers in lower and upper grade levels have reported that prosocial BATs were "effective" whereas anti-social BATs were "ineffective" in the classroom (Kearney et al., in press). In this study, students reported similar perceptions of "effectiveness/ineffectiveness" in terms of selective BAT use and student affect/teacher immediacy. That is, only prosocial BAT use led to student perceptions of greater teacher immediacy or approach which in turn, led to perceptions of higher affective learning. In contrast, "ineffective" teachers, as defined by non-immediacy and negative student affect, were perceived to employ more anti-social BATs. Third, previous research on secondary teachers and students indicated that effective prosocial BATs were those that were student-oriented, while ineffective BATs reflected teachers or peers as sources of power (Kearney et al., in press; McCroskey et al., 1984). Consistent with these findings, the results of this investigation confirm the distinction that students' affect and perceptions of teacher

immediacy are partially a function of student-oriented prosocial BATs and teacher or peer-oriented anti-social BATs.

Future investigations should focus on teachers' selective use of BATs in response to particular misbehavior problems in the classroom. Besides addressing differential use of BATs as a function of misbehavior "type," it is important to examine teachers' approach/avoidance behaviors with those problem-students who engage in habitual misbehaviors. Recognizing the contributions of both teacher nonverbal immediacy and prosocial BAT use for student affect, future investigations of this type can be more effectively designed to provide insights which will add to our understanding of the teacher/problem-student relationship in the learning environment.

## References

Andersen, J. F. (1979). Teacher immediacy as a predictor of teaching effectiveness. In D. Nimmo (Ed.), Communication Yearbook 3 (pp. 543-559). New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Books.

Andersen, J. F., Andersen, P. A., & Jensen, A. D. (1979). The measurement of immediacy. Journal of Applied Communication Research, 7, 153-180.

Andersen, J. F., Norton, R. W., & Nussbaum, J. F. (1981). Three investigations exploring the relationship between perceived teacher communication behaviors and student learning. Communication Education, 30, 377-392.

Argyle, M., & Kendon, A. (1967). The experimental analysis of social performance. In L. Berkowitz (Ed.), Advances in experimental social psychology (Vol. 3, pp. 55-98). New York: Academic Press.

Arlin, M. (1979). Teacher traditions can disrupt time flow in classrooms. American Educational Research Journal, 16, 42-56.

Borg, W. R., & Ascione, F. R. (1979). Changing on-task, off-task, and disruptive pupil behavior in elementary mainstreaming classrooms. Journal of Educational Research, 72, 243-252.

Burgoon, J. K. (1980). Nonverbal communication research in the 1970s: An overview. In D. Nimmo (Ed.), Communication Yearbook 4 (pp. 179-197). New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Books.

Burgoon, J. K., Buller, D. B., Hale, J. L., & de Turck, M. A. (1984) Relational messages associated with nonverbal behaviors. Human Communication Research, 10, 351-378.

Burgoon, J. K., & Saine, T. (1978). The unspoken dialogue: An introduction to nonverbal communication. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Clegg, A., & Megson, B. (1968). Children in distress. Harmondsworth, Middx: Penguin.

Condon, W. S., & Ogston, W. D. (1966). Sound film analysis of normal and pathological behavior patterns. Journal of Nervous and Mental Disease, 143, 338-347.

Emmer, E. T., & Evertson, C. (1980). Effective classroom management at the beginning of the year in junior high school classrooms (Tech. Rep. No. 6107). Austin: University of Texas, The Research and Development Center for Teacher Education.

Exline, R. V., & Eldridge, C. (1967, April). Effects of two patterns of a speaker's visual behavior upon the perception of the authenticity of his verbal message. Paper presented at the annual meetings of the Eastern Psychological Association, Boston, Mass.

Exline, R. V., & Winters, L. C. (1965). Affective relations and mutual glances in dyads. In S. S. Tompkins and C. W. Izard (Eds.), Affect, cognition and personality (pp. 319-350). New York: Springer.

French, J. R. P., Jr., & Raven, B. H. (1959). The bases of social power. In D. Cartwright (Ed.), Studies in social power (pp. 150-167). Ann Arbor, Mich.: University of Michigan Press.

Harris, M. B. (1972). Classroom uses of behavior modification. Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill.

Heal, K. H. (1978). Misbehavior among school children: The roles of the school in strategies for prevention. Policy & Politics, 6, 321-332.

Hoy, W. K. (1968). The influence of experience on the beginning teacher. The School Review, 76, 312-323.

Kearney, P., & McCroskey, J. C. (1980). Relationships among teacher communication style, trait and state communication apprehension, and teacher effectiveness. In D. Nimmo (Ed.), Communication Yearbook 4 (pp. 533-551). New Brunswick: Transaction Books.

Kearney, P., Plax, T. G., Richmond, V. P., & McCroskey, J. C. (1983, November). Power in the classroom III: Teacher communication techniques and messages. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Speech Communication Association, Washington, D.C.

Kearney, P., Plax, T. G., Richmond, V. P., & McCroskey, J. C. (in press). Power in the classroom IV: Teacher communication techniques as alternatives to discipline. In R. Bostrom (Ed.), Communication Yearbook 8. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Kearney, P., Plax, T. G., & Wendt-Wasco, N. J. (1984, May). The relative importance of teacher immediacy for affective learning across divergent courses. Paper presented at annual meeting of the International Communication Association, San Francisco.

Keiser, G., & Altman, I. (1976). Relationship of nonverbal behavior to the social penetration process. Human Communication Research, 2, 147-161.

Kendon, A. (1967). Some functions of gaze direction in social interaction. Acta Psychologica, 26, 22-63.

Krantz, M., & Scarth, L. (1979). Task persistence and adult assistance in the preschool. Child Development, 50, 578-581.

Krathwohl, D. R., Bloom, B. S., & Masia, B. B. (1956). Taxonomy of educational objectives, Handbook II: Affective domain. New York: David McKay.

Major, B., & Heslin, R. (1982). Perceptions of cross-sex and same-sex nonreciprocal touch: It is better to give than to receive. Journal of Nonverbal Behavior, 6, 148-162.

McCroskey, J. C., & Richmond, V. P. (1983). Power in the classroom I: Teacher and student perceptions. Communication Education, 32, 175-184.

McCroskey, J. C., Richmond, V. P., Plax, T. G., & Kearney, P. (1984). Power in the classroom V: Behavior alteration techniques, communication training, and learning. Manuscript submitted for publication.

McDowell, E. E., McDowell, C. E., & Hyerdahl, J. (1980, November). A multivariate study of teacher immediacy, teaching effectiveness and student attentiveness at the junior high and senior high levels. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Speech Communication Association, New York.

Mehrabian, A. (1967). Orientation behaviors and nonverbal attitude communication. Journal of Communication, 16, 324-332.

Mehrabian, A. (1968). Influence of attitude from the posture, orientation, and distance of a communicator. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 32, 296-308.

Mehrabian, A. (1969). Significance of posture and position in the communication of attitude and status relationships. Psychological Bulletin, 71, 359-372.

Mehrabian, A. (1971). Silent messages. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.

Mehrabian, A. (1981). Silent messages: Implicit communication of emotion and attitudes (2nd ed.). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.

Mehrabian, A., & Ksionzky, S. (1972). Categories of social behavior. Comparative Group Studies, 3, 425-436.

Patterson, M. L. (1973). Compensation in nonverbal immediacy behaviors: A review. Sociometry, 36, 237-252.

Richmond, V. P., & McCroskey, J. C. (in press). Power in the Classroom II: Power and learning. Communication Education.

Rodgers, M. A., & McCroskey, J. C. (1984, March). Nonverbal immediacy of teacher in classroom environments. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Eastern Communication Association, Philadelphia.

Rutter, M., Maughan, B., Mortimore, P., Ouston, J., & Smith, A. (1979). Fifteen thousand hours. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.

Scott, M. D., & Wheeless, L. R. (1975). Communication apprehension, student attitudes, and levels of satisfaction. Western Journal of Speech Communication, 41, 188-198.

Watzlawick, P., Beavin, J. H., & Jackson, D. D. (1967). Pragmatics of human communication. New York: W. W. Norton.

Wiener, M., & Mehrabian, A. (1968). Language within language: Immediacy, a channel in verbal communication. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts.

Wlodkowski, R. J. (1982). The great false hope: discipline. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 224785).

Table 1

Behavior Alteration Techniques and Revised Messages for College Teachers

| Technique | Sample Messages |
|---|---|
| 1. Immediate Reward from Behavior | You will enjoy it. It will make you happy. Because it is fun. You will find it rewarding/ interesting. It is a good experience. |
| 2. Deferred Reward from Behavior | It will help you later on in life. It will prepare you for getting a job (or going to graduate school). It will prepare you for achievement tests (or the final exam). It will help you with upcoming assignments. |
| 3. Reward from Teacher | I will give you a reward if you do. I will make it beneficial to you. I will give you a good grade (or extra credit) if you do. I will make you my special assistant. |
| 4. Reward from Others | Others will respect you if you do. Others will be proud of you. Your friends will like you if you do. Your parents will be pleased. |
| 5. Self-Esteem | You will feel good about yourself if you do. You are the best person to do it. You always do such a good job. |
| 6. Punishment from Behavior | You will lose if you don't. You will be unhappy if you don't. You will be hurt if you don't. It's your loss. You'll feel bad if you don't. |
| 7. Punishment from Teacher | I will punish you if you don't. I will make it miserable for you. I'll give you an "F" if you don't. If you don't do it NOW, it will be homework tonight. |
| 8. Punishment from Others | No one will like you. Your friends will make fun of you. Your parents will punish you if you don't. Your classmates will reject you. |
| 9. Guilt | If you don't, others will be hurt. You'll make others unhappy if you don't. Your parents will feel bad if you don't. Others will be punished if you don't. |
| 10. Teacher/Student Relationship: Positive | I will like you better if you do. I will respect you. I will think more highly of you. I will appreciate you more if you do. I will be proud of you. |
| 11. Teacher/Student Relationship: Negative | I will dislike you if you don't. I will lose respect for you if you don't. I will think less of you if you don't. I won't be proud of you. I'll be disappointed in you. |

Table 1 (continued)

| Technique | Sample Messages |
|---|---|
| 12. Legitimate-Higher Authority | Do it, I'm just telling you what I was told. It is a rule, I have to do it and so do you. It's school policy. |
| 13. Legitimate-Teacher Authority | Because I told you to. You don't have a choice. You're here to work! I'm the teacher, you're the student. I'm in charge, not you. Don't ask, just do it. |
| 14. Personal (Student) Responsibility | It is your obligation. It is your turn. Everyone has to do his/her share. It's your job. Everyone has to pull his/her own weight. |
| 15. Responsibility to Class | Your group needs it done. The class depends on you. All your friends are counting on you. Don't let your group down. You'll ruin it for the rest of the class. |
| 16. Normative Rules | The majority rules. All of your friends are doing it. Everyone else has to do it. The rest of the class is doing it. It's part of growing up. |
| 17. Debt | You owe me one. Pay your debt. You promised to do it. I did it the last time. You said you'd try this time. |
| 18. Altruism | If you do this it will help others. Others will benefit if you do. It will make others happy if you do. I'm not asking you to do it for yourself; do it for the good of the class. |
| 19. Peer Modeling | Your friends do it. Classmates you respect do it. The friends you admire do it. Other students you like do it. All your friends are doing it. |
| 20. Teacher Modeling | This is the way I always do it. When I was your age, I did it. People who are like me do it. I had to do this when I was in school. Teachers you respect do it. |
| 21. Expert Teacher | From my experience, it is a good idea. From what I have learned, it is what you should do. This has always worked for me. Trust me - I know what I'm doing. I had to do this before I became a teacher. |
| 22. Teacher Feedback | Because I need to know how well you understand this. To see how well I've taught you. To see how well you can do it. It will help me know your problem areas. |

Table 2

Correlations of Affective Learning with

Immediacy and Behavior Alteration Techniques

Study 1 and Study 2

| | Affective Learning | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | General Affect | Behaviors | Content | Instructor | Engage | Enroll |
| Study 1 (secondary N = 620) | | | | | | |
| Immediacy | .67 | .54 | .58 | .65 | .45 | .36 |
| BAT | | | | | | |
| 1 | .33 | .22 | .31 | .34 | .23 | .22 |
| 2 | .32 | .22 | .28 | .25 | .29 | .24 |
| 5 | .36 | .24 | .35 | .31 | .37 | .25 |
| 7 | -.34 | -.35 | -.28 | -.30 | - | -.27 |
| 13 | -.36 | -.34 | -.28 | -.40 | - | -.28 |
| 17 | -.26 | -.22 | -.23 | -.25 | - | -.23 |
| 19 | -.21 | - | -.20 | -.26 | - | - |
| 22 | .30 | .22 | .33 | .35 | .23 | - |
| Study 2 (college N = 1320) | | | | | | |
| Immediacy | .61 | .57 | .47 | .74 | .35 | .35 |
| BAT | | | | | | |
| 1 | .28 | .25 | .21 | .32 | .20 | - |
| 2 | .35 | .25 | .30 | .24 | .33 | .28 |
| 5 | .21 | - | - | .24 | - | - |
| 7 | -.20 | - | - | -.22 | - | - |
| 13 | -.26 | -.22 | -.21 | -.29 | - | - |
| 17 | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 19 | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 22 | .23 | .20 | - | .25 | - | - |

NOTE: Only correlations above ±.20 are indicated.
Correlations as low as ±.08 are significant with the sample size in study 1, ±.06 with the sample size in Study 2.

Table 3

Commonality Analysis Summary Table

Teacher Immediacy and BAT Use as

Predictors of Student Affect

| Study 1 (Secondary) | Squared Correlations* | | | Commonalities | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | BATs only | Immediacy only | Combined | Unique to BATs | Unique to Immediacy | Common to Immediacy & BATs |
| General Affect | .471 | .450 | .686 | .104 | .215 | .367 |
| Behaviors | .345 | .293 | .584 | .121 | .238 | .225 |
| Content | .413 | .336 | .619 | .090 | .206 | .323 |
| Instructor | .456 | .419 | .724 | .071 | .268 | .385 |
| Engage | .370 | .204 | .477 | .141 | .107 | .229 |
| Enroll | .321 | .130 | .395 | .033 | .122 | .240 |
| Study 2 (College) | | | | | | |
| General Affect | .278 | .375 | .467 | .087 | .185 | .195 |
| Behaviors | .194 | .324 | .372 | .045 | .176 | .151 |
| Content | .194 | .223 | .306 | .081 | .111 | .114 |
| Instructor | .289 | .549 | .589 | .038 | .298 | .253 |
| Engage | .167 | .121 | .215 | .093 | .047 | .077 |
| Enroll | .132 | .120 | .190 | .065 | .056 | .069 |

*All squared correlations are multiple except for immediacy which is simple.

Figure Caption

Figure 1. Models A and B as addressed in the research question.